

1 2 3 4 5 6	JEFFREY R. CHANIN (CSB # 103649) WARREN A. BRAUNIG (CSB # 243884) KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP 710 Sansome Street San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 391-5400 Facsimile: (415) 397-7188 Email: jchanin@kvn.com wbraunig@kvn.com LAUREN M. RULE (ISB # 6863), pro hac vice ADVOCATES FOR THE WEST	e
7	P.O. Box 1612 Boise, ID 83701	
8	Telephone: (208) 342-7024 Facsimile: (208) 342-8286 Email: lrule@advocateswest.org	
10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
11		
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
13	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
14	OAKLAND DIVISION	
15	WESTERN WATERSHEDS PROJECT;) Case No.: C 08-01460 PJH
16	NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL; CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL))
17	DIVERSITY; CALIFORNIA TROUT; ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION) STIPULATION OF DISMISSAL
18	INFORMATION CENTER; KLAMATH SISKIYOU WILDLANDS CENTER; and	ý))
19	SIERRA FOREST LEGACY,))
20 21	Plaintiffs,))
22	VS.)))
23	U.S. FOREST SERVICE,	ý))
24	Defendant.))
25)
26))
27		<i>)</i>))
28		,)
	I .	

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(2), Plaintiffs Western Watersheds Project, et al. and
Federal Defendant United States Forest Service hereby voluntarily dismiss the remaining claims
in this action from Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint (ECF No. 103). Plaintiffs' Third
Amended Complaint challenged ten categorical exclusion ("CE") decisions covering authoriza-
tion of livestock grazing. Those CE decisions were the following:
Klamath National Forest
Little North Fork CE; Shelly Meadows CE; Big Ridge CE; Big Meadows CE;
Modoc National Forest
Mount Dome CE; Beaver Dam, East Grizzlie, Timbered Mountain, and Surveyors Valley
CE;
Mendocino National Forest
Pine Mountain, York Cabin, Middle Creek and Elk Mountain CE;
<u>Lassen National Forest</u>
Deer Creek and Lyonsville CE; Champs Flat, Gooch Valley, Lower Pine Creek, and
North Eagle Lake CE;
Inyo National Forest
Tunawee, Ash Creek, Alabama Hills, and George Creek CE.
Subsequently, the Forest Service withdrew the two Modoc and the Inyo CE decisions.
See ECF No. 117, at 1.
The parties filed cross-motions for summary judgment as to two CE decisions: the Big
Ridge CE on the Klamath National Forest and the Pine Mountain, York Cabin, Middle Creek
and Elk Mountain CE on the Mendocino National Forest (ECF No. 136; ECF No. 147).
On March 30, 2012, the Court issued an Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part
Motions for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 159). The Court held the conclusions reached by the
Forest Service in connection with the Big Ridge CE and Mendocino CE decision memos were
arbitrary and capricious in certain respects and failed to take the "hard look" required by NEPA.
The Forest Service has subsequently acknowledged that, pursuant to the Court's
Summary Judgment Order, the Big Ridge and Mendocino CE Decision Memos are set aside, and

Case4:08-cv-01460-PJH Document170 Filed11/09/12 Page3 of 5

1	has notified Plaintiffs that, as of October 23, 2012, the Big Ridge allotment on the Klama		
2	National Forest and the Pine Mountain, York Cabin, Middle Creek and Elk Mountain allotmer		
3	on the Mendocino National Forest are currently scheduled for environmental analysis und		
4	NEPA during the 2014-2016 review period.	NEPA during the 2014-2016 review period.	
5	Of the remaining CEs challenged in Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint, the Fore		
6	Service has also notified Plaintiffs that it has withdrawn the Little North Fork, Shelly Meadow		
7	and Big Meadows CE decisions on the Klamath National Forest and the Champs Flat, Goo		
8	Valley, Lower Pine Creek, and North Eagle Lake CE decision on the Lassen National Forest. A		
9	of October 23, 2012, these allotments are current	of October 23, 2012, these allotments are currently scheduled for environmental analysis und	
10	NEPA during the 2014-2016 review period.		
11	Plaintiffs hereby dismiss with prejudice their claims against the one outstanding C		
12	decision from their Third Amended Complaint: the Deer Creek and Lyonsville CE from the		
13	Lassen National Forest.		
14	Pursuant to these actions by Defendant Fo	rest Service and Plaintiffs, all of the remaining	
15	claims in Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complain	nt are resolved. Therefore, Plaintiffs and	
16	Defendant Forest Service stipulate under Fed. R. C	Civ. P. 41(a)(2) that this case may be dismissed	
17	with prejudice, in accordance with the accompany	ing judgment.	
18	IT IS SO STIPULATED:		
19	FOR	PLAINTIFFS	
20		arren A. Braunig	
21	1 WAF	REY R. CHANIN REN A. BRAUNIG	
22	2 633 I	ER & VAN NEST LLP Battery St.	
23	B Tele _r	Francisco, California 94111 Shone: (415) 391-5400	
24		mile: (415) 397-7188 l: wbraunig@kvn.com	
25	5		
26	5		
27	7		
28	3		

Case4:08-cv-01460-PJH Document170 Filed11/09/12 Page4 of 5

1 2 3 4 5		/s/Lauren M. Rule LAUREN M. RULE ADVOCATES FOR THE WEST P.O. Box 1612 Boise, Idaho 83701 Telephone: (208) 342-7024 Facsimile: (208) 342-8286 Email: lru1e@advocateswest.org
6		FOR FEDERAL DEFENDANT
7	Dated: November 8, 2012	IGNACIA S. MORENO Assistant Attorney General
8		Environment & Natural Resources Division
9		/s/ <u>David B. Glazer</u> DAVID B. GLAZER
10		Natural Resources Section Environment & Natural Resources Division
11		United States Department of Justice 301 Howard Street, Suite 1050
12		San Francisco, California 94105 Tel: (415) 744-6491
13		Fax: (415) 744-6476 E-mail: David.Glazer@usdoj.gov
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20 21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
-		
	I .	3

Case4:08-cv-01460-PJH Document170 Filed11/09/12 Page5 of 5

1	[PROPOSED] ORDER		
2	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION AND	GOOD CAUSE APPEARING, the Court hereby	
3	approves the Parties' Stipulation of Dismissal.		
4	IT IS SO ORDERED		
5	Dated: 11/9/12	TES DISTRICE	
6	Dated:	HON. PHYLLIC AMILTON UNITED TO STRICT JUDGE	
7		UNITED STRICT JUDGE	
8		THE DISTRICT OF	
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			